UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,811	12/29/2000	Robert E. Gleichauf	062891.0462	8466

7590   05/13/2004

Barton E. Showalter
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	●	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/751,811		GLEICHAUF, ROBERT E.
	Examiner		Art Unit
	Aravind K Moorthy		2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _3/26/01_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _29 December 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-39 are pending in the application.

2. Claims 1-39 have been rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 12/29/00 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1),

which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration

by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein

has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6, 12, 14, 16-20, 22, 27, 29-31, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by White et al U.S. Patent No. 5,983,273.

As to claims 1, 29 and 36, White et al discloses a method for real-time insertion of

services during a call session over a communication network, comprising:

- initiating a service request message by a first client to a first server, the service

  request message including the first client identity and a requested service available

  from a second server comprising a plurality of services [column 8 line 55 to column 9

  line 7];

- determining if the first client is authorized to use the requested service at the first

    server [column 9, lines 42-48];

- and delivering the requested service to the first client by the second server if the first

    server determines that the first client is authorized to use the requested service

    [column 9, lines 59-67].

As to claims 2 and 17, White et al discloses that at least one of the services comprises an

application operable to provide text viewing and modification capabilities [column 6, lines 1-24].

As to claims 3 and 18, White et al discloses that at least one of the services comprises an

application operable to provide graphic viewing and modification capabilities [column 6, lines 1-

24].

As to claims 4 and 19, White et al discloses that at least one of the services comprises an

application operable to provide increased security during a call session [column 2, lines 52-61].

As to claims 5, 20 and 30, White et al discloses the method further comprising:

- comparing the first client identity and the requested service with a list stored in the

    first server, the list comprising a plurality of clients authorized to use at least one of

    the services available from the second server [column 9, lines 59-67];

- and issuing a ticket to the first client if the list includes authorization for the first

    client to use the requested service [column 10, lines 27-43].

As to claims 6, 31 and 37, White et al discloses the method further comprising:

- comparing the first client identity and the requested service with a list stored in the

    first server, the list comprising a plurality of clients authorized to use at least one of

    the services available from the second server [column 9, lines 59-67];

- issuing a ticket to the first client if the list includes authorization for the first client to use the requested service, the ticket including the first client identity and the requested service; sending the ticket to the second server by the first client [column 10, lines 27-43];

- and reading the ticket at the second server to retrieve the requested service [column 10, lines 27-43].

As to claims 12 and 27, White et al suggests pressing a button associated with the requested service at the first client during a call session to initiate the service request message [column 8 line 55 to column 9 line 7].

As to claim 14, White et al discloses a communication system, comprising:

- a client operable to couple to a communication network [column 3, lines 51-61];

- a first device operable to couple to the communication network, the first device comprising a list of clients authorized to use at least one of a plurality of services [column 5, lines 29-46];

- and a second device operable to couple to the communication network, the second device further operable to insert one or more of the services requested by the client into a call session if the list includes the client and a requested service [column 5, lines 47-58].

As to claim 16, White et al discloses that the first device is operable to determine if the client is authorized to use the requested service [column 5, lines 29-46].

As to claim 22, White et al suggest that the communication system further comprises:

- a plurality of remote clients coupled to the communication network [column 3, lines 19-37];

- and a plurality of remote second devices coupled to the communication network, each remote second device associated with at least one of the remote clients [column 3, lines 19-37].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action: .

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 7-11, 21, 23-26, 32-35, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al U.S. Patent No. 5,983,273 as applied to claims 1, 14, 29 and 36 above, and further in view of Bittinger et al U.S. Patent No. 5,983,273.

As to claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 21, 23-26, 32, 33, 35, 38 and 39, White et al teaches comparing the first client identity and the requested service with a list stored in the first server. White et al teaches that the list comprises a plurality of clients authorized to use at least one of the services available from the second server. White et al teaches issuing a ticket to the first client if the list includes authorization for the first client to use the requested service. White et al teaches that the ticket includes the first client identity and the requested service.

White et al does not teach sending the ticket and an address associated with a second client to the second server by the first client. White et al does not teach reading the ticket at the second server to retrieve the requested service for a second client. White et al does not teach

delivering the requested service to the second client based on the address received from the first

client.

Bittinger et al teaches sending the ticket and an address associated with a second client to

the second server by the first client. Bittinger et al teaches reading the ticket at the second server

to retrieve the requested service for a second client. Bittinger et al teaches delivering the

requested service to the second client based on the address received from the first client [column

7, lines 1-49].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified White et al so that the ticket sent from the first

client to the second server included the address associated with a second client. The second

server would have read the ticket and retrieved the requested service. The service would have

been delivered to the second client based on address received from the first client.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified White et al by the teaching of Bittinger et al because by

moving a server-side registry to a computer hosting a client application (i.e., a "client-side"

registry), a server application can notify a client application when server application startup

processing is complete and can provide a server stub associated with the server application to the

client application. As a result, a client application can be automatically notified that a server

application is ready to receive client application requests. Consequently, the need for server

polling may be eliminated [column 3 line 65 to column 4 line 7].

As to claims 9 and 34, White et al teaches comparing the first client identity and the

requested service with a list stored in the first server. White et al teaches that the list comprises a

plurality of clients authorized to use at least one of the services available from the second server [column 5, lines 47-58]. White et al teaches issuing a ticket to the second server if the list includes authorization for the first client to use the requested service [column 7, lines 24-40].

6. **Claims 13 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al U.S. Patent No. 5,983,273 as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Lancaster et al U.S. Patent No. 5,854,894.**

As to claims13 and 28, White et al does not teach selecting the requested service from a menu displayed on the first client during a call session to initiate the service request message.

Lancaster et al teaches selecting a requested service from a menu displayed on the first client during a call session to initiate the service request message [column 2, lines 12-18].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified White et al so that client selected the desired service from a service menu display to initiate the service request message.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified White et al by the teaching of Lancaster et al because a menu provides a means for a client to know what services are available by a second server.

7. **Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al U.S. Patent No. 5,983,273 as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Berbec et al U.S. Patent No. 6,122,631.**

As to claim 15, White et al does not teach that the client further comprises a cache operable to store a requested service and the requested service removable from the cache when the call session terminates.

Berbec et al teaches a client that comprises a cache operable to store a requested service

and the requested service removable from the cache when the call session terminates [column 5,

lines 19-27].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified White et al so that client would have stored the

requested service in cache and would have removed the the requested service from cache when

the call session terminated.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified White et al by the teaching of Berbec et al because this

allows the client to access files dynamically and allow the server to distribute files in a secure

manner [column 1, lines 47-61]

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K Moorthy whose telephone number is 703-305-1373. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Aravind K Moorthy
May 10, 2004

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100